

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

NOV 23 2004

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/5B/21 (08-00)


Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<h1>TRANSMITTAL FORM</h1> <p>(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</p>	Application Number	09/897,826
	Filing Date	3 July 2001
	First Named Inventor	Stephen M. REUNING
	Group Art Unit	2175
	Examiner Name	Samuel RIMELL, Esq.
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	Diedre Moire Corp.

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks Enclosed find a Request for Rehearing under Rule 197(b). No fee is enclosed, because none is believed required.		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Pharmaceutical Patent Attorneys, LLC 55 Madison Avenue, 4th floor, Morristown NJ 07960-7397 USA
Signature	
Date	See below date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: <input type="text"/>		
Typed or printed name	Mark POHL, Reg. No. 35,325	
Signature	<input type="text"/>	Date 23 Nov 04

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**


Approved for use through 10/31/2002, OMB 0851-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

**Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the  
United States Patent and Trademark Office Central Facsimile Center  
(703) 872-9306

on 23 Nov 04

Date



Signature

Mark POHL, Reg. No. 35,325

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

The submitted papers are enumerated on the enclosed Transmittal Form,  
PTO Form SB/21.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 23 2004

5 *Ex parte* Stephen M. REUNING  
Serial No. 09/897,826  
Filing Date: 03 July 2001

Appeal No.: 2004-1714

10 Rule 197(b)  
REQUEST FOR REHEARING

15 Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Mail Stop - Board of Patent Appeals  
Alexandria, VA 20231

20  
RULE 197(B) REQUEST FOR REHEARING

25 This REQUEST FOR REHEARING is submitted in response to the DECISION ON APPEAL (30  
Sept 2004). This paper is due within two months of the mailing date of the DECISION ON  
APPEAL; this paper is thus believed timely filed. No fee is believed required.

30 GROUNDS UPON WHICH REHEARING IS SOUGHT

Applicant respectfully believes the Board has failed to fully understand the agency's  
previous administrative fact findings. Applicant senses that this error may simply be due to the  
Office's failure to forward to the Board the complete prosecution history, including a copy of the  
parent application file, Serial No. 08/984,650.

35 The immediate case recites claims copied from the parent application. In the parent case,  
the Examiner accepted Applicant's RULE 132 DECLARATION to antedate the MCGOVERN  
reference. In the immediate case, however, the Examiner refuses to accept the same  
DECLARATION, to antedate the same reference, for the same claims.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

*Ex parte* Stephen M. REUNING  
Serial No. 09/897,826  
Art Unit 2175  
Examiner Samuel RIMELL, Esq.

#### POINTS OF LAW OR FACT OVERLOOKED OR MISAPPREHENDED

The DECISION ON APPEAL correctly notes that "the claims on appeal are different from the claims allowed in the parent application." See DECISION ON APPEAL at 3.

5 This is incorrect. The claims on appeal are different from those recited included in the published issued parent patent. The parent application, however, included additional claims found allowable by the Office. After the Office confirmed the patentability of this subject matter, these claims were deleted from the parent and filed in the immediate case, based on the Examiner's representation that these claims would be promptly allowed.

10 The DECISION ON APPEAL also misapprehends the content of MCGOVERN, because the DECISION contradicts the agency's administrative factual findings that MCGOVERN fails to each claim element.

The DECISION accurately summarizes the claimed invention as a system for locating an individual with specifically defined professional qualifications. See DECISION at 1. The  
15 DECISION accurately summarizes the claimed invention:

1. A system for locating an individual with specifically defined professional qualifications, the system comprising: a. a filter that can search a web page to identify in said web page the presence or absence of specifically defined professional qualifications, and b. an e-mail address extractor that can extract an  
20 e-mail address from said web page.

Thus, application claim 1 entails using specifically defined criteria to filter web pages, and then extracting email addresses from them. The parent application recited similar application claims. For example, parent application claim 18 claims:

25 18. A computer implemented method comprising: a. locating an Internet site page or web posting which contains operator specified text comprising specifically defined experiences ....; b. extracting from said Internet site page or web posting an email address; and c. sending an electronic mail message to said extracted address.  
30

*Ex parte* Stephen M. REUNING  
Serial No. 09/897,826  
Art Unit 2175  
Examiner Samuel RIMELL, Esq.

See AMENDMENT IN SERIAL NO. 08/984,650 at 4-5 (15 Feb. 2000). Thus, parent application claim 18, like the immediate application claim 1, entails using specifically defined criteria to filter web pages, and then extracting email addresses from them.<sup>1</sup>

In the parent case, parent application claim 18 was rejected as obvious over MCGOVERN. See OFFICE ACTION at 4-6 (1 May 2000).

In response, Applicant submitted a RULE 132 DECLARATION (14 July 2000). In response, the Office withdrew the obviousness rejection over MCGOVERN and conceded that claim 18 is patentable. See e.g., OFFICE ACTION at 2 (24 Aug. 2000).

In response to the 1 May 2000 obviousness rejection over MCGOVERN, Applicant also explained that "McGovern does not disclose a system involving getting an e-mail address — by extraction or otherwise — from an Internet page or web posting; McGovern's e-mail addresses need to be individually sent to or input into the system." See AMENDMENT at 6-7 (14 July 2000) (emphasis in original). In response, the Office withdrew the rejection based on MCGOVERN and conceded that claim 18 is patentable. See e.g., OFFICE ACTION at 2 (24 Aug. 2000).

The Office made an express written finding that claim 18 is patentable (in fact, the Office reiterated this finding more than once). The Office has found that "comparing text against professional qualifications and electronically extracting e-mail addresses when those qualifications are met" is a novel, non-obvious combination. Based on the Office's written fact finding, Applicant filed the immediate application. Having made this fact finding, and having represented to Applicant *in writing* that the immediate subject matter is patentable, the Board should not condone the Examiner's arbitrary and capricious change in position.

<sup>1</sup> N.B.: Parent application claim No. 18 also includes a third step: sending an email. It might have been argued that this third step differentiates the two claims, making the Applicant's Declaration applicable to one, but not the other. The Office, however, specifically rejected this argument, finding, to the contrary, that extracting an email address inherently includes sending an email as a mere obvious variant thereof. The Office has therefore found step c. not material.

*Ex parte* Stephen M. REUNING  
Serial No. 09/897,826  
Art Unit 2175  
Examiner Samuel RIMELL, Esq.

## SUMMARY

The DECISION ON APPEAL (30 Sept 2004) relies on factual assumptions which are directly contradicted by the agency's prior administrative fact findings. MCGOVERN fails to include each claim element, and MCGOVERN must be withdrawn as a reference because the Office has previously concluded that Applicant antedates it.

Respectfully submitted,

*J. Mark Pohl*  
Pharmaceutical Patent Attorneys, LLC  
55 Madison Avenue, 4th floor  
Attention: Mark POHL (P 4014)  
Morristown, NJ 07960-7397 U.S.A.  
23 November 2004

Mark POHL, Reg. No. 35,325  
Direct [Mark.Pohl@LicensingLaw.Net](mailto:Mark.Pohl@LicensingLaw.Net)  
☎ +1 (973) 984-0076

mhc:mp

SD:\D:\dred\09897,826\Appeal Reconsideration.doc

APPEAL RECONSIDERATION — Page 4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY